



DT07 Rec'd PCT/PTO 28 MAY 2004

\$ PCT  
4/10

**Certification under 37 CFR 1.8a**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with The United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 25, 2004.

Brian W. Hameder  
Name

Brian W. Hameder  
Signature

DOCKET: CU-2882

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

APPLICANT: John LOVE et al.

SERIAL NO: 10/089,276

Group Art Unit:

TITLE: SINGLE MODE OPTICAL WAVEGUIDE  
FIBRE

THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RECEIVED**  
88 JUN 1 2004  
Legal Coun  
International Division

Attention: PCT Legal Office


**RESPONSE TO COMMUNICATION REGARDING DECISION ON PAPERS**  
**FILED UNDER 37 CFR 1.42**

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Communication mailed March 10, 2004, a copy of which is attached.

The four declarations previously submitted on behalf of the joint inventors John Love, David Thorncraft, Ronald Bailey, Simon Fleming, Mark Sceats, Leon Poladian, Thomas Ryan and Peter Krug only consisted of six pages. The declaration executed by Jane Large as executrix on behalf of Michael Large included the added page 7 for their signature.



LADAS & PARRY  
CHICAGOLadas & Parry  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60604

2004 MAR 15 PM 2:45

51009

In re Application of  
Love et al.  
Application No. 10/089,276  
PCT No.: PCT/AU00/00919  
Int. Filing Date: 02 August 2000  
Priority Date: 30 September 1999  
Atty. Docket No.: CU-2882 RJS  
For: Single Mode Optical  
Waveguide Fibre

COMMUNICATION

This is in response to "Response To Decision On Papers Under 37 CFR 1.42" filed on 31 March 2003, which is being treated under 37 CFR 1.42.

### DISCUSSION

On 28 January 2003, a Decision according status under 37 CFR 1.42 and relating to papers filed on 18 July 2002 was mailed to counsel. That decision stated in part that

Review of the copy of the declaration filed on 03 June 2002 reveals that it is unclear whether joint inventors John Love, David Thorncraft, Ronald Bailey, Simon Fleming, Mark Sceats, Leon Poladian, Thomas Ryan and Peter Krug signed complete declarations, since the declarations bearing their signatures do not include page 7 of 7.

Counsel now urges that "the five Declarations submitted on July 18, 2002 meet the formality requirements of the Office" because "only the Declaration executed by Jane Lange as executrix on behalf of Michael Lange included the added page 7 for her signature" and, referring to the Declarations signed by the other joint inventors, "The added page 7 was not included in these Declarations as the information regarding the executrix was not available at the time of submitting the documents to the aforesaid inventors for signature. Unfortunately however the page numbering thereon was not corrected."

The four Declarations were defective in that the evidence of record (in the form of the paginations appearing on the bottom of each Declaration sheet) suggests that each of the four Declarations consisted of 7 sheets, but only six sheets are present in each such Declaration. Did counsel originally number the Declaration pages with the intent to include a sheet listing information for the legal representative of the deceased joint inventor, and later omit such sheet, or is there another explanation for the paginations? It is unclear whether joint inventors John Love, David Thorncraft, Ronald Bailey, Simon Fleming, Mark Sceats, Leon Poladian, Thomas Ryan and Peter Krug signed complete declarations, since the declarations bearing their signatures do not include page 7 of 7.

### CONCLUSION

The application was accorded status under 37 CFR 1.42 by the Decision mailed on 28 January 2003. However, acceptance of the Declaration of the inventors filed on 03 June 2002 is **REFUSED**, without prejudice.

The Declaration filed on 03 June 2002 remains defective for the reasons explained above. Applicants are required to file a proper response within **TWO (2) MONTHS** of the mailing date of this Communication, **including a new oath or declaration of the inventors**. Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). Failure to timely reply will result in **ABANDONMENT**.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop PCT, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the PCT Legal Office.



Boris Milef  
PCT Legal Examiner  
PCT Legal Office



George M. Dombroske  
PCT Legal Examiner  
PCT Legal Office  
Tel: (703) 308-6721  
Fax: (703) 308-6459